



Sustainable Luangwa: Securing Luangwa's water resources for shared socioeconomic and environmental benefits through integrated catchment management

Basic Information

GEF ID

10412

Countries

Zambia

Project Title

Sustainable Luangwa: Securing Luangwa's water resources for shared socioeconomic and environmental benefits through integrated catchment management

GEF Agency(ies)

WWF-US

Agency ID

WWF-US: G0022

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Jaime Cavelier

PIF

Part I – Project Informatics

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

The project is aligned with the BD-1-1, BD-2-7 and LD-1-4.

The BD investments aim at the creation of the Luangwa Water Resource Protection Area (WRPA) (25,000 ha) and the improve management of the Mafinga Hills National Forest Reserve (15,000 ha). LD investments to the improve management of 40,000 ha (but see below on restoration indicators) for a total of 80,000 ha.

Cleared

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

COMPONENT 1

1. All outputs and activities to improve the enabling environment for planning and coordination of stakeholders are welcome. However, plans and platforms make sense only if there is a strong ownership from national and local stakeholders, the capacity to implement and sustain the activities beyond the life and budget of this project (i.e. sustainability). Who is going to co-finance this component?
2. Is it necessary to have all the following bodies and plans for this project to work? i) Multi-stakeholder Upper Sub-Catchment Council (SCC); ii) Upper catchment Water User Associations (WUAs); iii) Integrated Catchment Management Plan (ICMP); iv) Development of District Environmental Management Action plans. What is it going to be required for these plans to get used, implemented and updated as needed? These plans tend to get outdated pretty fast because of the lack of funds and capacity for implementation.
3. What is going to be the legal status of the Water Resource Protection Area (WRPA)? Is this area going to have the same legal stability as other conservation and sustainable development areas in Zambia? Please elaborate.

COMPONENT 2

1. Although the proposed interventions appear reasonable (i.e. Boundary demarcation; Management Plans; Training and operational support -vehicles, motorcycles, maintenance, equipment, and field supplies, for patrolling and monitoring; assisted regeneration,etc) the budget is not. Suggest relocating funds from Component 1 to 2, and/or reduce the number of NFR.
2. What is the expected cost of the assisted regeneration and what the area?

COMPONENT 3

1. What are the "Community Conservation Agreements" and what is the experience in Zambia with this or similar agreements?
2. What are the private sector companies mentioned in this component?
3. Are outputs 3.1.5 and 3.1.6 viable and doable with the resources and time available for this project?

11-5-19

Why is there such a bureaucratic and complicated structure in Component 1?. There is a Multi-stakeholder Upper Sub-Catchment Council (SCC), upper catchment Water User Associations (WUAs), the Water Resources Management Authority (WARMA), Integrated Catchment Management Plan (ICMP) and Integrated Catchment Management (ICM). This is over-complicated and set up for failure in the short term, not to mention the sustainability beyond the time and budget of this project. This must be simplified.

The budget allocation to the different component should be revised. Not clear that the Budget for Component 1,2 and 4 should be in the same order of magnitude. Is it really necessary to spend nearly \$300K in KM, M&E? What about more than \$600K in Technical Assistance in Component 1? In contrast, components 2 & 3, which are at the core of the project are supposed to receive \$800K+ and \$1.0 million + respectively. Please re-balance the budget.

11-6-19

Cleared

Agency Response

11/4/19

Component 1

1. The Catchment Management Plan and related action plans and platforms are critical elements to ensure the long-term sustainability and upscaling of what the project will set in motion; without this, the impact of the project would be limited to localized action. CMP and platform also respond to a clear demand from the existing policy framework for water and catchment management in Zambia, building on the example set with the Kafue Catchment Management Plan.

This component will be co-financed by WWF Zambia and by the Ministry of Water Development, Sanitation and Environmental Protection, specifically the arm of the Ministry responsible for planning and regulations – WARMA. This has been clarified in the co-finance table (section C) and in table 1 on stakeholder roles in implementation.

2. This point is taken and agreed that there is a risk of plans being outdated fairly quickly. Establishment of the SCC, WUAs and development of the CMP follows the structure outlined in the Water Resources Management Act no. 21 of 2011. SCC and WUAs are given authority under the Water Act to work as the local level of WARMA to develop the Catchment Management Plan. This will be the second ICMP developed in Zambia. In the case of Kafue, it was found that the process of establishing the SCC and WUAs and developing the ICMP was a key step for creating a consensus driven, collective vision for the catchment. The project goes beyond developing an Integrated Catchment Management Plan by ensuring that the management structures for the implementation of these plans (WUAs and catchment council) are put in place.

Noting this point on numerous plans and plans going out of date, the development of District Environmental Management Plans has been removed from output 1.1.2. in the PIF.

3. Once an area has been defined and gazetted as a WRPA, it will legally be protected under the Water Resources Management Act No. 21 of 2011 under the mandate of WARMA. In this Act "Water resource protection area" means a "catchment, sub catchment or geographic area that is declared, by the Minister, as a water resource protection area under section twenty-nine". The WRPA is going to receive protection status similar to current PAs although the actual IUCN category under which the WRPA will fall under is not yet defined, but likely Category VI. This has been updated in the PIF narrative under Outcome 1.2 and in the core indicator worksheet.

Component 2

1. Noted. The project will focus on only one NFR – Mafinga Hills NFR. It is understood that Mafinga Hills NFR is the most critical NFR to protection of the source of the Luangwa, and this will be confirmed in project preparation stage.

The change to focus on only one NFR has been updated throughout the PIF.

2. The expected cost can be projected at about 300USD per hectare, and the expected area for assisted regeneration is about 2% of the Mafinga Hills National Forest Reserve, approximately 300 hectares. This has been reflected in the PIF.

Component 3

1. These are agreements enshrined in legislative pieces, the Forest Act No. 4 of 2015 aimed devolving forest management's role to local communities, community forest regulations, 2018.

Zambia has had experience with community conservation agreements. They have proved to be successful in the Muchinga Province and Northern Provinces under Lake

2. COMACO is the private sector referred to. The PIF has been updated for Output 3.1.3 to note linkage to markets, rather than to private sector, as that is what the private sector partner will do – provide sustainable agriculture support for farmers and link them directly to markets (through their "Its Wild" brand).

3. Given reduced budget, 3.1.5 will reduce scope to focus on participatory designation and management of community forest areas outside and near Mafinga Hills NFR only. Output 3.1.6 on community rehabilitation of degraded forest land in Luangwa headwaters has been removed.

11/06/2019

- Noted. Given that developing an ICMP is a highly consultative and stakeholder-driven process, we have removed outcome 1.1 from the PIF, ie the ICMP and the stakeholder structures, as there might not be adequate resources for the process and setting up of these structures. This will reduce the scope of the project in line with the reduced budget. The outcome on the WRPA was moved to C2 on protected area management. This has been reflected in table B and PIF narrative.
- Noted. The M&E component budget has now been reduced to \$190,000 (now 7% of subtotal for activities) and split the balance to C2/3. After removing ICMP, C1 budget was also split between C2/3. New component budget breakdown: 1) \$ 1,296,936, C2 \$1,264,640 and C3 \$190,000. This is reflected in table B.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

1. The GEF funding may not sufficient to carry out all the proposed activities. See suggestions to address this above.
2. Of the \$21.5 million of co-financing, \$18.09 are expected to be Investment Mobilized. Assume they will assist covering the corresponding activities of Component 2 & 3. Please confirm that these funds will become available for implementation after CEO Endorsement. Without these funds, this project is unlikely to get off the ground.

11-5-19

Please add the Type of co-finance of the WECSZ - Wildlife and Environmental Protection Society of Zambia (Table C)

11-6-19

Cleared

Agency Response

11/14/19

1. Noted. Given the reduction in budget, the scope of work has been reduced accordingly by:
 - Reducing the number of NFRs under outcome 2.1 to one area, Mafinga Hills NFR
 - Reducing the scope of output 3.1.3 to include conservation agriculture actions by farmers around the Mafinga Hills NFR only
 - Removing output 3.1.6 on Community rehabilitation of degraded forest land in the Luangwa headwaters

These changes have been reflected in table B and narrative of PIF.

2. COMACO has confirmed making co-financing funds available (estimated as \$5.75 Million) to assist in covering corresponding activities of components 3 in particular, providing sustainable agriculture support for farmers and assist in linking them directly to markets.

The other portion of the investment mobilized is grant funds (GCF) mobilized by the government to the same landscape this proposed project will work in. This is the GCF SCRALA project in Zambia, which identifies Mafinga District as one of its target areas. The SCRALA project activities related to water access for smallholder farmers and linkages with rural agricultural markets complements this project

strategy, particularly conservation agriculture actions with smallholder farmers in and around the Mafinga Forest Reserve and community rehabilitation of degraded forest land in the Luangwa headwaters.

All cofinance has been estimated for the project period, i.e. after and not before CEO Endorsement estimated date.

11/06/2019

Type of co-finance for WCSZ has been added to Table C. Recurrent.

```
<!-- /* Style Definitions */ p.MsoNormal, li.MsoNormal, div.MsoNormal {mso-style-parent:""; margin-top:0in; margin-right:0in; margin-bottom:8.0pt; margin-left:0in; line-height:107%; mso-pagination:widow-orphan; font-size:11.0pt; font-family:"Times New Roman"; mso-ascii-font-family:Calibri; mso-ascii-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-fareast-font-family:Calibri; mso-fareast-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-hansi-font-family:Calibri; mso-hansi-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-bidi-font-family:"Times New Roman"; mso-bidi-theme-font:minor-bidi;} p.MsoListParagraph, li.MsoListParagraph, div.MsoListParagraph {margin-top:0in; margin-right:0in; margin-bottom:8.0pt; margin-left:.5in; mso-add-space:auto; line-height:107%; mso-pagination:widow-orphan; font-size:11.0pt; font-family:"Times New Roman"; mso-ascii-font-family:Calibri; mso-ascii-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-fareast-font-family:Calibri; mso-fareast-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-hansi-font-family:Calibri; mso-hansi-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-bidi-font-family:"Times New Roman"; mso-bidi-theme-font:minor-bidi;} p.MsoListParagraphCxSpFirst, li.MsoListParagraphCxSpFirst, div.MsoListParagraphCxSpFirst {mso-style-type:export-only; margin-top:0in; margin-right:0in; margin-bottom:0in; margin-left:.5in; margin-bottom:.0001pt; mso-add-space:auto; line-height:107%; mso-pagination:widow-orphan; font-size:11.0pt; font-family:"Times New Roman"; mso-ascii-font-family:Calibri; mso-ascii-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-fareast-font-family:Calibri; mso-fareast-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-hansi-font-family:Calibri; mso-hansi-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-bidi-font-family:"Times New Roman"; mso-bidi-theme-font:minor-bidi;} p.MsoListParagraphCxSpMiddle, li.MsoListParagraphCxSpMiddle, div.MsoListParagraphCxSpMiddle {mso-style-type:export-only; margin-top:0in; margin-right:0in; margin-bottom:0in; margin-left:.5in; margin-bottom:.0001pt; mso-add-space:auto; line-height:107%; mso-pagination:widow-orphan; font-size:11.0pt; font-family:"Times New Roman"; mso-ascii-font-family:Calibri; mso-ascii-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-fareast-font-family:Calibri; mso-fareast-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-hansi-font-family:Calibri; mso-hansi-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-bidi-font-family:"Times New Roman"; mso-bidi-theme-font:minor-bidi;} p.MsoListParagraphCxSpLast, li.MsoListParagraphCxSpLast, div.MsoListParagraphCxSpLast {mso-style-type:export-only; margin-top:0in; margin-right:0in; margin-bottom:8.0pt; margin-left:.5in; mso-add-space:auto; line-height:107%; mso-pagination:widow-orphan; font-size:11.0pt; font-family:"Times New Roman"; mso-ascii-font-family:Calibri; mso-ascii-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-fareast-font-family:Calibri; mso-fareast-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-hansi-font-family:Calibri; mso-hansi-theme-font:minor-latin; mso-bidi-font-family:"Times New Roman"; mso-bidi-theme-font:minor-bidi;} @page Section1 {size:8.5in 11.0in; margin:1.0in 1.25in 1.0in 1.25in; mso-header-margin:.5in; mso-footer-margin:.5in; mso-paper-source:0;} div.Section1 {page:Section1;} /* List Definitions */ @list l0 {mso-list-id:1946380715; mso-list-type:hybrid; mso-list-template-ids:408819258 134807553 134807555 134807557 134807553 134807555 134807557 134807553 134807555 134807557;} @list l0:level1 {mso-level-number-format:bullet; mso-level-text:□; mso-level-tab-stop:none; mso-level-number-position:left; margin-left:38.5pt; text-indent:-.25in; font-family:Symbol;} -->
```

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

All the \$ figures are in line with the GEF Policies on Agency Fees and PPG amount. But see issues of \$ figures in LoE and Portal below.

11-5-19

Cleared

Agency Response

11/4/19

Updated LoE (23 Oct) uploaded in Portal.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

Yes. But see issues of \$ figures in LoE and Portal below.

11-5-19

Cleared

Agency Response

11/4/19

Updated LoE (23 Oct) uploaded in Portal.

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

1. The project mentions land restoration as an important element of the project. However, there is no indicator related to this aspect. Please, make clear the distinction between areas under SLM (indicator 4.3) and restoration (indicator 3). Please consider the different restoration options, without making any duplication with the indicator 4.3: 3.1) Area of degraded agricultural lands restored, 3.2, Area of forest and forest land restored, 3.3) Area of natural grass and shrublands restored, and 3.3) Area of wetlands (including estuaries and mangroves) restored.

2. Please, explain the definition of beneficiaries and how the number was estimated/calculated. The # of beneficiaries (700) seems pretty low in correlation with the 40,000 ha under SLM (4.3). Based on the number of people in the agriculture camps (20,000), if 35% practice shifting agriculture, the number of beneficiaries should be closer to 7,000 than 700. Please, confirm.

11-5-19

Cleared

Agency Response

11/4/19

1. The core indicators have been updated to include Indicator 3.

The assisted regeneration under 2.1.4 corresponds to core indicator 3.2, Area of forest and forest land restored. Approximately 300 hectares. Please note this is within the Mafinga Hills National Forest Reserve, so there is potential double-counting with 1.2. on effective PA Management.

The restored forest land is distinct from the figure in indicator 4.3 which is all land outside of protected areas that will be under improved farming practices.

2. Agreed that the number of beneficiaries from the SLM was estimated too low. The team reviewed the calculations and have revised the number of beneficiary farmers to 2,000 based off the 40,000 ha area for SLM. Additionally, about 140 beneficiaries will be supported with the ICMP process, both from communities, sub-catchment councils and water user associations and consultation groups, as well as government staff from district, provincial and national levels. This takes the total number of beneficiaries to 2,145, which also reflects changes made to project scope (Mafinga Hills NFR).

This has been reflected in the core indicator worksheet.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

Please indicate where Table G is. Thanks

11-5-19

Cleared

Agency Response

11/4/19

Table G is now included in the Portal.

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

Cleared

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

Cleared

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

Yes

Cleared

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

Yes. See window No. 1

Cleared

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-5-19

Cleared

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-19-21

Please elaborate on the Biodiversity benefits associated with the proposed areas. Is it possible to know the biodiversity value of those hectares and what is their conservation status?

11-5-19

Cleared

Agency Response

11/4/19

Mafinga Hills is an area rich in biodiversity and of international and global conservation importance, providing ecosystem services beyond Zambia. Mafinga Hills NFR is home to the source of the Luangwa River, one of the major tributaries of the Zambezi, and one of the four major rivers of the country. Together they form part of the Eastern Afromontane biodiversity hotspot. Due to its rich variety of endemic flora and fauna species, Mafinga Mountains is listed as a Key Biodiversity Area of Zambia (<http://www.keybiodiversityareas.org/site/factsheet/24247>). Mafinga Hills NFR is located within Mafinga Mountains KBA.

The whole Luangwa Catchment hosts the Luangwa Floodplains, designated a RAMSAR Wetland of International Importance. The catchment also includes large areas of Miombo Woodland, designated as one of five High Biodiversity Wilderness Areas by CI, and one of the Global 200 Ecoregions by WWF. These ecosystems support important terrestrial and aquatic species, including the endangered marsh mongoose (*Herpestes palustris*), African clawless otter (*Aonyx capensis*), spotted necked otter (*Lutra maculicollis*), hippopotamus (*Hippopotamus amphibious*), African wild dog (*Lycaon pictus*) and the critically endangered hook-lipped (black) rhino (*Diceros bicornis*).

This has been included in the project description in the PIF and in the section on global environmental benefits, with more specifics on the biodiversity value of the Mafinga Hills.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

Cleared

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

Thanks for the maps. Very clear.

Cleared

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

Please indicate what stakeholders were engaged during the development of this PIF or will be engaged during the development of the CEO Endorsement.

11-5-19

Cleared

Agency Response

11/4/19

PIF narrative and stakeholder table has been updated to include further details on stakeholders engaged during PIF development process (field trips and validation workshops).

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

The GEF does not see how gender issues will be included in the different components and activities, as the different plans, the multi-stakeholder platforms, and the implementation of activities on the ground. Either this information is available and can reflect it in the PIF, or this information is not yet available. If the latter, please confirm that the gender action plan will address these issues during the PPG.

11-5-19

Cleared

Agency Response

11/4/19

The gender action plan developed in project preparation will address the gender entry points for the different components and activities, multi-stakeholder platforms and plans, and implementations of activities on the ground. This has been noted in the PIF.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures

that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

Yes. A very detailed table.

Cleared

Agency Response

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

Cleared

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

Yes. A very detailed table. Thanks.

Cleared

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

Yes. Suggest reduce the scope (and budget) of Component 4 and reallocate the funds to components 2 & 3.

11-5-19

Cleared

Agency Response

11/4/19

Noted. However, the team would like to keep the scope and budget of Component 4 as is to ensure impact and sustainability. The scope and budget of components 2 and 3 have been reduced and reflected in PIF (see above).

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

The amounts for the Project and PPG are not the same in the LoE (10 October) and the values in the Portal. Please review all \$ figures in Portal and make them consistent with the LoE

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Amount (in US\$)			
			Project Preparation	Project	Fee	Total
GEFTF	WWF-US	Land Degradation	17,250	348,133	32,885	398,268
GEFTF	WWF-US	Biodiversity	132,750	2,691,022	254,139	3,077,911
Total GEF Resources			150,000	3,039,155	287,024	3,476,179

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
WWF-US	GET	Zambia	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	2,691,022	242,192	2,933,214
WWF-US	GET	Zambia	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	198,133	17,831	215,964
Total GEF Resources(\$)					2,889,155	260,023	3,149,178

PPG Amount (\$)

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

100,000

9,000

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
WWF-US	GET	Zambia	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	93,000	8,370	101,370
WWF-US	GET	Zambia	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	7,000	630	7,630
Total Project Costs(\$)					100,000	9,000	109,000

11-5-19

There is a revised LoE

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Amount (in US\$)			
			Project Preparation	Project	Fee	Total
GEFTF	WWF-US	Land Degradation	7,000	198,133	18,461	223,594
GEFTF	WWF-US	Biodiversity	93,000	2,691,022	250,562	3,034,584
Total GEF Resources			100,000	2,889,155	269,023	3,258,178

The PPG amounts and associated Agency Fee are in line with the LoE

E. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Amount (\$) PPG Agency Fee (\$)
100,000 9,000

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
WWF-US	GET	Zambia	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	93,000	8,370	101,370
WWF-US	GET	Zambia	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	7,000	630	7,630
Total Project Costs(\$)					100,000	9,000	109,000

Cleared

Agency Response

11/4/19

Updated LoE (23 Oct) uploaded to Portal.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response**EFSEC DECISION****RECOMMENDATION**

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10-21-19

No. Please address outstanding issues.

11-5-19

No. Please address issue of co-financing in Table C.

Please also address the issues raised under "Indicative project/program description summary" (Table B) and co-financing.

11-6-19

Yes. This PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

Cleared

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/21/2019	11/4/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/5/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/5/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/6/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		